DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 028 461 CG 003 715

Achievements and Challenges. The HEW Forum Papers. Second Series.
Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Washington, D.C.
Pub Date 69
Note-50p.
EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$2.60
Descriptors-*Educational Change, Educational Objectives, *Educational Planning, Federal Government, *Government Publications, Government Role, Leadership Qualities, *Professors, Program Planning, Program Proposals

The first lecture of this series focuses on the role of today's professor, caught in the middle of two campus revolutions, one of which he is the beneficiary and the other, the target. The second lecture considers the importance of understanding the future in preparing youth for it, and the extent to which the future is knowable. Current projections of alternative futures for our society suggest (1) significant alterations in the ways we carry out instructions, (2) topics providing vehicles for learning, and (3) education as a fundamental value. The third lecture contends that regular governmental institutions have not responded to rapid social change. The fourth is a pragmatic look at some of the essential characteristics of leadership, with particular emphasis on leadership role in an administrative setting. The final lecture is a review of the major accomplishments of this decade in health, education, and welfare, a discussion of remaining problems, and a pin-pointing of future goals over the next decade. (KP)

ED028461

H-X

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF
HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

"Achievements and Challenges"

THE HEW FORUM PAPERS

SECOND SERIES
1968–69

003715

"Achievements and Challenges"

THE HEW FORUM PAPERS

SECOND SERIES

1968-69

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

Foreword

OF ALL THE AGENCIES of the Federal Government, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare is the one most intimately concerned with the problems and aspirations of people. It serves their need for protection from disease and environmental hazards. It nourishes their hope of transcending handicaps, whether of old age or physical disability, economic situation or social status. It reflects their desire for better education and deeper understanding. It encourages the dreams they want to realize for themselves and their children.

The HEW Forum lectures show how this concern for people takes the Department to the frontiers of science and to the challenge points of social policy. I hope they will inspire every HEW employee to look beyond his own operation and gain a new understanding of the larger effort it is part of. I hope they will convey to people outside HEW a degree of insight into the range and magnitude of this HEW effort, as well as a measure of the earnestness and vitality that goes into it.

Wilbur J. Cohen

The HEW Forum Lectures

Second Series

	PAGE
THE UNIVERSITY: REFORM, REVOLUTION, or REACTION? RALPH K. HUITT, *Assistant Secretary for Legislation*	3
PROJECTING ALTERNATIVE FUTURES DR. HENDRIK D. GIDEONSE, *Director—Program Planning and Evaluation, Bureau of Research, Office of Education*	13
THE LIMITED RESPONSE OF GOVERNMENTAL INSTITUTIONS TO RAPID SOCIAL CHANGE—AND SOME ALTERNATIVES EDWARD C. SYLVESTER, *Assistant Secretary for Community and Field Services*	27
LEADER: A PERSON THAT LEADS DR. JAMES H. MCCROCKLIN, *Under Secretary*	35
ACCOMPLISHMENTS, PROBLEMS AND CHALLENGES IN HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE WILBUR J. COHEN, *Secretary*	41

The HEW Forum Lectures

THE HEW FORUM lectures are an attempt to give the employees of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare a broader perspective on the work of the Department as a whole by exposing them to the ideas and personalities of the top officials in the Department.

The first Forum series was held in the HEW Auditorium in Washington, D.C., between December, 1967, and June, 1968. Thirteen outstanding leaders in the Department addressed the Forum. Their lectures were reprinted in an earlier volume, entitled: "What's Going On in HEW?"

The first series was so successful that a second series was given between October 30, 1968, and January 15, 1969. Five lectures were given:

—Ralph K. Huitt, Assistant Secretary for Legislation, discussed the role of the modern-day professor caught in the middle of two campus revolutions, one of which he was the beneficiary and the other, the prime target. Mr. Huitt drew on his own experience not only as a Washington official concerned with the problems of the educational community, but as a former professor at the University of Wisconsin.

—Dr. Hendrik D. Gideonse, Director, Program Planning and Evaluation, Bureau of Research, Office of Education, considered the importance of understanding the future in preparing youth for it, and especially the extent to which the future is knowable. Current projections of alternative futures to our society, said Dr. Gideonse, suggest that some significant alterations are called for in the way in which we carry out instructions, the kinds of topics that should provide the vehicles for learning, and the way in which we hold education as a fundamental value for society.

—Edward C. Sylvester, Assistant Secretary for Community and Field Services, was concerned by the fact that the regular governmental institutions have not responded to rapid social change. He found that "regular channels" are not only clogged with red tape but sometimes serve the wrong constituent, and he suggested alternative devices for coping with the problems of the poor and unorganized.

—Dr. James H. McCrocklin, Under Secretary, took a pragmatic look at some of the essential characteristics of leadership, emphasizing particularly its role in an administrative setting.

—Wilbur J. Cohen, the outgoing Secretary, concluded this Forum series with a broad review of the major accomplishments of this decade in the fields of health, education and welfare and a comprehensive discussion of the problems that remain. He also pin-pointed the goals in these areas that the Nation should pursue over the next decade.

THE UNIVERSITY: REFORM, REVOLUTION OR REACTION?

DR. RALPH K. HUITT
Assistant Secretary for Legislation
of the
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare

TWO revolutions in higher education have occurred in my lifetime.

Let me use personal illustrations, if I may. The first revolution is the change in demand. My mother told me that when her first child was born she resolved that every one of her children should get a high school diploma. Given those times and her circumstances, this was an ambitious aspiration. It is significant that of her four children, the first two did get high school diplomas and the second two, who were born a decade later, both earned college degrees.

My brother graduated from high school about nine years before I did, in a time when the neighborhood expected a working man's son to drop out of high school and help the family with its problems. Certainly the notion that he would persist in going to school after he graduated from high school was not regarded very highly. Moreover, the opportunity was not there. The loans and other student assistance that we have now were not available. My brother went to college one summer on an eight percent, ninety-day loan he got from the First National Bank, and at the end of the summer he came home to pay it back. But in just nine years, by the time that I was out of high school, the general expectation was that a poor boy with gumption could and should get a degree, and there were private loans available at that time that were as generous as the ones that the Federal Government now makes.

My son graduated from high school in a world in which a B.A. degree at the minimum is considered a *sine qua non*. My son was not convinced. He married and had a baby instead—and at twenty-three he is back in college because it is expected now that any person who is bright and able *will* go to college.

Delivered on October 30, 1968.
330-821—69——2

The pressure of many, many youngsters going to college has helped to produce the second revolution which has occurred in my academic lifetime.

When I went to the University of Wisconsin in 1949 the situation was something like this: The impecunious professor was a stock figure in literature and the movies— the man who wore patches on his sleeves and drove an old car, sometimes by preference. His students were sympathetic with him and they patronized him just a bit. There was not very much research money except perhaps in the sciences. I remember that we could count on one summer of research support in three. The University had an ungenerous leave policy, which was typical. We could get one year's leave without much trouble but anyone who asked for a second was putting his academic career on the line.

There was not very much involvement on the part of the faculty in the life of the community. Literally, I have known people to get Ph. D.'s in political science who had never been inside the Capitol, one mile away. The deans were powerful men—not the tyrants that they had been a generation earlier, but nonetheless people whose respect and support were eagerly sought by young professors. The chairmen were powerful figures, and old and prestigious professors were listened to with care and treated with respect.

Nevertheless, the essential University attitudes were there. We were told that the professorial stool has three legs; one is teaching, another is community service and the third is research. But the deans and the chairmen were too honest to leave it there. They told us that research had to be done by all means; if your teaching was negligible and your community service nil, nevertheless you had better publish. This was not quite, let me hasten to say, publish or perish. I cannot recall that anyone ever was actually killed. Nevertheless you recognized that if you wanted to stay there this was what you did.

Needless to say, the demand quickly began to overrun the supply. New technology in the country required that students get degrees. The government began to encourage students to go to school; the G.I. Bill was the first big step. The government and the private sector began to vie for the services of professors, many of whom found they could do a great deal better for themselves away from the campus. So what had been a buyers' market suddenly became a sellers' market, and the competition for professors became fierce. All this has had the effect of emphasizing a lot which had been latent on the University campuses all the time.

One result, of course, has been the emphasis on graduate education. In a University it is a professor's relationship to the graduate program that determines his status. Graduate education, which is largely voca-

tional, has been handled extremely well by American universities. I know a distinguished professor in an English university who go his Bachelor's degree from Oxford but went to Berkeley for his Ph. D. He though this was quite right. "The English handle undergraduate education incomparably better than the Americans do", he said, "but if you want a real graduate degree you have to go to the United States". Even the small colleges, which have always been the refuge of the bright student who wants imaginative teaching, have been geared into this so that the small college professor measures his success in terms of the number of his undergraduates who go on to graduate work.

At the same time, pressure for research and publication was redoubled. This does not necessarily mean insistence on good research. It almost means emphasis on research for its own sake, and many things that never should be published have been published. If it was not possible to get respectable journals to take their research output, or if the audience was so tiny that no one except 40 scholars and perhaps the tenure committee could be expected to read it, there were the university presses, getting bigger every year turning out things that could not possibly make money. Grants were made to individuals who had the power to take their grants with them if they left the campus. Competition for the research stars became great. Universities shopped for them. Paradoxically, of course these great men came to spend less and less time on the University campus, but the competition for them nevertheless was keen.

I remember a Nobel Prize winner at the University of Wisconsin who was happy there, but who was recruited for two years by another university which finally got him by constructing a building for him (with guess whose funds), staffing it with the people that he named and finally raising the ante so high that he simply could not afford not to go. Moreover, many professors found that they could set up what amounted to private businesses on the outside and make large sums of money. Read the article by James Ridgeway in the recent *Harper's* magazine, "Colleges as Big Business", and see the kinds of things that professors are doing with their time. Some academic mercenaries are not really tied to the University; they are prepared to follow pay and prestige and facilities wherever they lead. Many of them regard themselves as members of their discipline, not as persons really tied to a particular campus. This meant inevitably a decline in the control of the University by the administration.

One of the amusing things to somebody who has lived in a University is to see how the administration somehow got to be the villain in the piece. As a matter of fact, the President fights the legislature and raises money and worries about all kinds of things but he has very little control over what really happens on the campus. It is the

faculty—which, generally speaking, means the departments—which hires and fires the professors. It is the department which makes the curriculum.

This is the second revolution which has overtaken the University campuses which I think everyone will recognize who has spent very much time on them. The effect on the students, of course, has been great. Interest in teaching was never really discouraged but it was regarded as a kind of personal idiosyncrasy. The teacher who indulged in good teaching ran the risk that he would get to do a lot of it because the word got around and his classes got to be extremely big. The curriculum became a hodge-podge because the departments controlled it. This meant the professors could teach pretty much what they wanted, which meant they tended to teach what they did research in or what they had a grant for. And so departments found it difficult to offer the basic courses necessary in the various disciplines. It might be hard, for example, to get a man to teach a general course in Comparative Government when what he really wanted to teach was a course in "Personnel Administration in Yemen" or something else that suited his fancy. I have heard a graduate chairman in a truly great university say that his department could not honestly turn out a Ph. D. with the kinds of basic information he ought to have because all of their professors were teaching something exotic.

Many professors came to have a small interest in students and the pressure was on to cut the teaching load. In fact, one of the ways to compete for a young professor is to tell him he will not have to teach. A university which has a teaching load in the social sciences of as much as six hours a week is at a competitive disadvantage. Some of the stars, away in Europe or Washington, might be listed in the catalog for years without teaching.

This is understandably hard on students. I have seen this kind of thing many times: Senior undergraduates, about to get out of college, come around and say: "I want you to look at me, I want you to put my name down. I'm going to have to have references to get a job. I don't really know any professor in this University". There certainly were many professors who knew many students, but it is possible to have a student two or three times in big classes and not know him at all.

Nevertheless, even in this situation, the administration continued to try to maintain rules for the personal lives of its students. You would think that some university administrators had never heard of the automobile or the pill. They seemed really to believe that as substitute parents they could maintain control over the lives of their students which their real parents never had.

I suppose the most tragic thing that has come out of the revolution is the loss of a genuine liberal education. I am one of many who be-

lieve that a liberal education is the best preparation a student can have. The student who gets a liberal education goes to college and gets guidance from wise and mature people and further guidance from books to which they refer him. He finds in the lives of the people with whom he is associated models to copy. This student can expect to get answers to the great questions, or at least to hear them talked about: What is justice? What is law? What is the good life? This student can expect to be confronted with the great problems of society: What causes poverty? What can be done about delinquency? What is discrimination? This is what he can expect from a liberal education, the kind of education that is designed to prepare him for life and for the world. The kind of education which helps him to ripen and become an adult prepared to take his place in the world. This is what I think has gone down the drain at the universities and at many of the small colleges, too.

This second revolution is what Jenks and Reisman call *the* Academic Revolution, which has occurred in the last 15 to 20 years. The principal beneficiaries of it have been the faculties. One brilliant young colleague of mine about 15 years ago was offered a very good job by a private employer. When he turned it down he said: "I'd be a fool to take it. We are entering the Age of the Professor". How prophetic he was! He has done much better on the University campus than he could do outside. The victims of this revolution have been the students—not the graduate students but the undergraduates.

Of course I have painted this picture black deliberately. I have overstated it because I wanted to draw it in sharp outline. There have been many fine relationships between students and professors on my campus and I have had many myself. I know and have known many teachers who like to teach. But I think that the outlines here are correct in the main, and I would say that this system was overripe for reform long before the students ever reacted. I think that the reforms of this system must succeed. I think they will succeed because they are backed by the best students who want and will accept reform, and because many University professors recognize the need for reform too.

Now let's take a look for a moment at the exceedingly difficult problem posed by the student's counter-revolution as John Fischer calls it.

First, there is the problem of goals. The goals of many students are tied to what I've just said: They want to change the system to improve the education they get, to cut in on the rules that govern their lives and that kind of thing. But there are goals also that often go beyond the University. There are goals associated with the war, anxiety over the draft—which is a kill-or-be-killed proposition for some of them. Frustration and resentment over the war in Viet Nam and the Uni-

versity's part in it lead to attempts to dictate to the University what part it can play, and to efforts to end the recruitment of young people for the services and for establishments like Dow Chemical Company. Any contribution that the University makes to the war potential of the country is bitterly criticized.

Another problem is racism. Many students believe that the University administration is indifferent to it, that they ignore the ghetto just outside the boundaries of the University, that they do not do for the black students what the University can do. Some students have a general hostility toward the system as a whole; they hold that it is hypocritical, that the great goals are not achieved. They believe that majority will is frustrated and that what this society stands for cannot be achieved. They say they want a participatory democracy in which they can take part in everything that affects their lives and presumably the same kind of participation will be possible for every one else.

Unfortunately, the University is a symbol for them of the great society and the nearest thing at hand for them to get at.

These ideas have the ring of idealism and surely in many, perhaps most, cases they are idealistic. Often they are held by the brightest and most able students in the universities. But notice at the same time that they are simplistic, that frequently they are couched in self-righteousness and sometimes in self-pity, and surely they present an over-simplified version of what this system really is like. I suspect, for instance, if these students examined the real role of the so-called Establishment—those people who are opinion leaders and leaders at the University and leaders of Government—they would find that these leaders are infinitely more humane, more generous and more sophisticated about the needs of the weak and the helpless than the populace is as a whole. I myself would be unhappy to have some people in this Democracy participate in it more than they now do. But the point I want now to make is this: What are these young people prepared to do to bring about some sorely needed changes?

There are many on the campus who want change and reform, whether it is in the University or in the system as a whole. These are young people whom I would call, for lack of a better term, the New Liberals because they want to do what liberals have always sought to do.

I recognize that this may be a term wholly unacceptable to them and if it is I ask them simply to put it down to the generation gap. I am talking about people who know what they want, people who can specify evils and ways to change them, people who are prepared to work with and negotiate with anybody who will help to bring about their kind of change.

There is also an element—I think a tiny element by all accounts—which might be called for lack of a better term the New Left. Daniel Boorstin calls them the New Barbarians. You may call them what you please; these are the people who believe they must destroy the system and the place to start is the University. They are quite frank that they have nothing to substitute for the system, but that they think it is so bad, and the University is so bad, that the first thing to do is to tear it down brick-by-brick, starting with the University. Perhaps—perhaps—something better will take its place.

I think there is a vital distinction, which must be kept clear, between those who are willing to bring about change and to accept change and those who believe that no change is going to be satisfactory. This distinction must be made, and these groups must be separated in the perceptions of the public and in the minds of the students themselves. There is an analogy. I can remember in the 1930's and as late as the 1950's, liberals had precisely the same problem with the Communists. Liberal groups which wanted to achieve change first had somehow to separate themselves in the public mind from the Communists. Making this kind of distinction now is going to be more difficult because the New Left has not, so far as I know, affiliated with foreign organizations. They *do* talk about democracy, they *are* sympathetic with many things with which liberal groups are sympathetic. But somehow, it seems to be, the New Liberals—as opposed to the New Left—must be won to the universities and they must be given success.

A second problem arising out of this counter-revolution is the problem of methods. This is not easy; we have not decided in this country what methods are permissible. From the actions of labor and civil rights groups, from the use of demonstrations and confrontations and sit-ins, there comes the question of whether *any* means which brings about a sought-for end is not all right. These methods merge into disruption and obstruction, and into violence and destruction. I do not believe society will permit this. The liberals have not yet done the kind of hard thinking which is necessary to work out what are the permissible actions in attempting to bring about social change.

I say to you now, and I believe it is so, that the destruction and violence will be stopped. The question is: Who will do it? Will the University do it? Well, who in the University is going to do it? For the University administration there is the problem that, in fact, "these are our kids"—perhaps not their own children but people like their children, brought up in a permissive climate as they brought up their own children. And in some cases, they are flesh and blood children; the boy who cut down the United States flag over the Administration Building at Wisconsin is the son of a dean at one of the Wisconsin State Universities.

What about the faculty? Indeed—some of the younger members of the faculty in many cases are aiding and abetting the students. Moreover, what the faculty is beginning to discover—because the kids are beginning to discover it—is that *they* are the logical targets; now it is not the administration but the faculty itself which is coming under fire. And to call on the faculty to stop this kind of thing by instituting reforms is to call on them to surrender their dearest prerogatives. If any elite group in the history of the world has ever happily done that, it has escaped my attention.

Congress distrusts University leadership. Many Members do not believe that the universities can stop the obstruction. This year, when this Department attempted to get a liberal student-unrest amendment put into our legislation the Members of Congress to whom I talked who would not go along said something like this: "I want a mandate. It may put only one kid out of the University or take the money away from him, but I want a mandate because I don't believe those University people will do anything at all".

I believe it is necessary for the faculty and the students and the administration to unite to find a way to bring about reform and to stop destruction and violence, because if they do not do it the middle-class will do it.

Let's look for a moment at this system that some people have set out to destroy. This is a system which has been marvelously adaptable to the needs of disadvantaged interests. Again and again it has taken in the outsiders—labor, farmers, successive waves of migrants—and now I believe it is in the process of taking in the blacks and the poor. But as a consequence of its success in bringing in outsiders the system is extremely conservative, so that groups tend to hold on to the gains they have made and they are hostile to the system-destroyers.

Have a look at history. Labor flirted with Marxism and other foreign ideologies for 30 or 40 years. All it got for them was ferocity, hatred, and cracked skulls—until a cigar maker named Samuel Gompers discovered that the way to win in this system is to embrace it. So Samuel Gompers became more laissez-faire than the Chamber of Commerce. Every speech he made was conservative. What he said was: "We like this system, but we want more".

The farmers had great difficulty so long as they fought the system, but they too adapted and they are beneficiaries now. Do you remember how they reacted to Mr. Dewey in 1948 when they thought that Dewey threatened what the farmers had achieved?

Consider the Poor Peoples Campaign in Washington this summer. Perhaps you attended the Solidarity Day observance and listened to the speeches—I didn't hear them all, but I heard 15 or 16. The theme

again and again was: "We believe in the American dream but we have been left out. We support American democracy, but it has not treated us fairly". I submit that this is the theme to which the people in this country respond because they share the conviction that the wealth of this country should belong to all the people and the good things of life should not be held by just a few. When people do not threaten the system, but say we want our fair share of it, they are talking a language that the people who built the system understand.

There are millions of people in this country who have made progress, who have seen their children do better, and who will make room for someone else. But if they see their gains threatened, they will strike back. There is plenty of evidence that they are doing that now. Consider the fury of the police when they deal with students. Most policemen are from the lower middle-class which has drawn with great pain the line that divides respectability from poor trash. That line includes, on the good side, self-discipline, respect for parental and other authority, cleanliness in dress, no use of profanity before women, and so forth. The policeman sees the epithet-shouting, dirtily-dressed privileged person as someone who is deliberately plotting against what have been the goals of people like himself. He knows he is held down by lack of education, and he is confronted by those who have that advantage but are attempting to mock him.

Consider the support for George Wallace. Have you not been impressed by it? Or the reaction of legislatures across the country? Or the reaction of Congress? I believe that if legitimate authority in the University cannot regain control and restore order, with the support of responsible and humane people on and off the campus, order *will* be restored by quite different people who have hardly an inkling what a marvelous and complicated achievement a free University is.

Violence breeds violence, as everyone knows. Consider the retributive violence which is beginning to occur. At the University of Wisconsin, according to the newspapers last May, there had been something like 50 incidents during the school year in which car-loads of off-campus young men drove around the campus until they found some bearded youth, then jumped out and beat him up.

Now some of the students who objected to the city police coming on the campus in the Dow-Jones riot are quite critical of the city police for *not* coming on the campus to protect them from hoodlums like these. The significant thing is that violence is beginning to be met by violence.

I believe, therefore, that we face two alternatives. One is the old cycle of repression in which legislatures and police and the politicians join forces to attempt to put the lid on with a new wave of loyalty oaths, disclaimers, affidavits, and that kind of thing. Sometimes I

have the feeling that I have seen a bad movie and this is where I came in, because there is a beginning of the kind of thing we saw in the late 1940's and through the late 1950's. If we cannot short-circuit this development, the internal change which must be made will be forced, with great difficulty and pain for everyone.

Let us hope that this is not the way that order is to be restored and reform, almost surely, lost. Because there is the alternative of internal control by academic people themselves, which can assure both order and reform. This will require that all of us who love the University and know how utterly our civilization depends on it, will rally to it. What is needed is clear thought about the missions of the University and permissable means to achieve them, and the courage to speak out. We must see that those who have in their trust the great universities of the land will bring about what reforms are needed, freely and with a good heart; and that in so doing they will win the affection and respect of the best young people we have.

PROJECTING ALTERNATIVE FUTURES: IMPLICATIONS FOR EDUCATIONAL GOALS

HENDRIK D. GIDEONSE

Director, Program Planning and Evaluation,
Bureau of Research, Office of Education

I WANT TO EXPLORE this afternoon the significance of projecting alternative futures as a basis for determining educational goals and generating objectives for curriculum. I want to direct our professional attention to the concerns that are and will be relevant to our clients, the present and future students in our educational institutions. My proposition, simply put, is that there can be no more significant organizing principle for rendering a liberal education relevant to the learner of today than the idea that tomorrow's futures are invented by us today and that the possibilities open to us stem from a thorough understanding of the richness of the options available and the consequences of exercising various combinations of them.

Let me say a couple of things about the language which I have used so far. I have, for example, referred to "futures" in the plural and I have used the verb "project" rather than other terms that might have been employed. I have used these words with considerable care. There are several reasons for this.

First, the verb "project" is used in the sense of casting forward and because it implies that our vision of the future is something we *do* to it, not something we find out about it. George A. Miller, the Harvard psychologist, has made the statement that the future is very much "at the mercy of what we imagine it to be, and serious efforts to foresee it are less exercises in accurate prediction than they are attempts to reduce the eternal gap between what is humanly desirable and what is humanly possible." [1]

Second, I have consistently referred to "futures" in the plural because there are as many possible futures ahead as there are options confronting us. In contrast, the idea of prediction, for example, implies only one possible future, the one that is being predicted. We know

[1] George A. Miller, "Some Psychological Perspectives on the Year 2000," *Daedalus*, Summer, 1967, p. 896.

Delivered November 20, 1968.

that prediction is impossible because in the case of all but trivial predictions it is always possible for some human action to counter them. The fact of human choice renders the future plural and the human role with respect to those futures that of inventor.[2]

You may then ask, in the face of this fact of choice, how it is possible to study the future in rigorous ways. This is an important question. Methodology *is* critical, and I want to spend just a moment on the question of techniques for studying the futures before moving to a more extended consideration of the substantive consequences of such directed inquiry.

The first thing that needs to be said about methodology is that traditional canons of science cannot be applied to anticipation about the future or to evaluations of what those futures might be. We are not dealing with questions of fact. Just the same, there are methods or procedures which can facilitate responsible, public dialog about the futures. A recent nine-month study, for example, completed with Office of Education support identified 21 methods for conjecturing about the future.[3] The list is not exhaustive, but it is certainly suggestive. No methods were included in this listing unless sufficient information was available about them to ascertain whether they possessed the attributes of a defined sequence of procedures which are systematically followed in all applications, unless they provided for the communicability of the knowledge produced in a form such that it could be employed by other investigators, and unless they allowed for the independent verifiability of the claims the knowledge produced. I will not cover all 21 methods; I do want to described briefly one of them and mention a few others.

One technique for studying the future is the so-called Delphi technique. This is a procedure for systematically soliciting and collating the opinions of experts on the future of pre-selected subjects. The technique uses sequential individual interrogations, usually in a questionnaire format. An effort is made to achieve consensus or convergence of opinion by the feedback of results to the participants. Using this technique a group of experts may be asked individually first to generate a list of events that they expect will occur in the next 20 to 50 years in a particular field in their area of competence. This list is then collected and distributed to all the participants. Each participant is then asked to indicate when he believes each of the events listed will occur.

[2] Two books which might interest the reader who is moved to inquire further into the study of the future are *The Art of Conjecture* by Bertrand de Jouvenel (Basic Books, Inc., New York: 1967) and *Inventing the Future* by Dennis Gabor (Alfred A. Knopf, New York: 1964).

[3] Perry E. Rosove, "A Provisional Survey and Evaluation of the Current Forecasting State of the Art for Possible Contribution to Long-Range Educational Policy Making," in ED 014 623, ERIC Document available from ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS), The National Cash Register Company, 4936 Fairmont Avenue, Bethesda, Maryland 20014.

The respondents' estimates are then returned to the participants with the indication of the complete range of responses given by the participants and how it breaks into quartile ranges. This makes it possible for each individual respondent to determine where his response rests relative to all the others. For those responses falling outside the two center quartiles—or, broadly speaking, the mode of all the responses—specific reasons for or against such responses are requested. When received, these are again communicated to the participants. The possibility of changes in professional estimate is always left open to the respondents if they find the reasons either convincing or outlandish.

This is just one method. Other examples that might be named include science fiction of the Heinlein and Asimov tradition, scenario writing of the kind which Herman Kahn and Tony Wiener of the Hudson Institute have become such skilled proponents,[4] contextual mapping, the construction of relevance trees, or the development of deterministic models or mathematical abstractions of real world phenomena.

I have spent a couple of moments referring to methodology, possibly as a plea for legitimacy, but primarily to illustrate that projecting futures can be extremely rigorous and to suggest that we ought not to pay much attention to it unless it is.

Now let us turn our attention to alternative futures. First, the problem of urbanization. At present our population stands somewhere over 200 million. About 140 million are classed as urban dwellers. If we run the demographic projections out to the year 2000, some 280 million of a projected total population of 340 million are expected to be living in urban areas. If, in addition to the population trends, we project out other trends we can now clearly see, it is certain we will have some extremely serious problems by the year 2000. Harvey Perloff described it in the following way.

"Water and air would be dangerously polluted. An increase in pollution at rates now characterizing some of our bigger cities would make relatively pure air and water among the scarcest and costliest of all natural resources. Traffic congestion in the air over our cities would be horrendous. Open space close to where people live would be so scarce that the use of park and other open recreation areas would probably have to be rationed.

"Central cities would be more segregated than ever. They would contain a majority of non-whites while the surrounding suburban and ex-urban areas would be white. Slums would still be very much with us, and the central cities would continue to be the gathering ground

---

[4] See, for example, Herman Kahn and Anthony J. Wiener, *The Year 2000, A Framework for Speculation on the Next Thirty-three Years,* The Macmillan Company, New York, 1967.

for the poor and disadvantaged. Some of the larger cities would have all the appearance of being ungovernable. Reliance on the Federal Government would increase to the point where local governments would merely be agents of the former. The gap between the rich and untroubled suburban communities and the central cities—with burdensome public service requirements and the relative limited tax capacity—would be greater than ever.

"Most new construction would be extensions of present suburbs, a large proportion in one-income, one-race, enclaves that keeps undesirables out by zoning and taxation. Some new towns would cluster around major metropolitan areas, providing an attractive environment for the residents, but they would be beyond the reach of lower income families. There would also be some very impressive greenbelts to keep undesirables out.

"Long commuting trips, cross-tripping of Negroes and whites, downtown congestion, and lack of parking space would be the order of the day. New super highways would be cutting cities to ribbons, and yet in-town transportation would continue to be a headache." [5]

What Perloff did in developing this scenario was to highlight some of the more obvious *present* difficulties. He pointed out that there would *not* be more and more of the same in the year 2000. The grossest of failures would be recognized as such and changes will be made.

But easily the most significant feature of urban development is the projection that by the year 2000 the number of Americans living in an urban environment will double and that this will occur without very much of an increase in the present land area already designated as urban. In other words, not only will the absolute number of urban dwellers increase but so will their density. And while it is possible that this population increase could lead to the bleak picture that Perloff imagined, he himself adopts a much more provocative stance by suggesting that the realization that urban environments will have to be provided *in the next 30 years for as many additional people as are now living in our cities* could very well cause the *possibilities* to appear in their true dimensions. And therefore he calls for the solution of the more thorny urban problems through the ability to create totally new communities—in both open and in-town areas—specifically designed to achieve significant political and social ends.

Let me now turn to a second topical area, the world of communications. That we are in the midst of a revolution here is undeniable.[6]

---

[5] Harvey S. Perloff, "Modernizing Urban Development," *Daedalus*, Summer, 1967, p. 789–790.

[6] See "Communications" by Theodore A. Smith and "The New Look in Information Systems" by William T. Knox in *Prospective Changes in Society by 1980*, Designing Education for the Future, Denver: 1966. Also John R. Pierce, "Communication," *Daedalus*, Summer, 1967.

Perhaps in no field are the accomplishments, the power, and the applicability of science and technology so clearly exemplified as in the field of communications. Telephones, television, computers, and laser technology all call to mind the degree to which the last 50 years represents a period of dramatic transition in the speed, complexity, availability, and impact of new communication forms.

Perhaps even more significant are some of the emergent qualitative aspects of this revolution. Until 1940 the primary object of all communications systems was the transfer of information from one place to another. But since 1940 the new look in communications revolves around the technological revolution in information *processing*. Computers now process information as well as communicate back the results.

In talking about communications I cannot help refer also to the impact that television has had and will have on the life of the Nation. In some ways, for example, TV has tended to have a unifying effect by making it difficult for dialects and parochial viewpoints to survive, but in other respects it has tended to encourage diversity (indeed, in some eyes, fragmentation) by allowing each citizen to view major social, political and governmental events directly and to form their own immediate first-hand judgments about these occurrences without the intervention of other initial screening mechanisms of one kind or another. A classic instance of this would be one network's reportage of the events in the streets of Chicago during the Democratic Convention through the simple mechanism of airing raw footage without benefit of editorial comment. While it was not possible to gauge fully the extent of the provocation for the incidents in question—a situation which arose in the first place because of the limitations placed on press coverage by the police—there could be little question in the minds of anyone who viewed what was shown on the screen, that there was incident after incident of unnecessarily brutal police action against individuals who had already been subdued and were quite obviously completely under police control. Examples such as this constitute instances of the power of the new communications media to render elements of directness and immediacy to perception and judgment as exercised in the political process. It is reasonable to project even greater impacts of this kind in the future.

The power of television to carry social education to new sectors of the community is a second factor of considerable moment. It is demonstrated, I think, in the new awareness of lower socio-economic groups in our society of the degree to which they are not full participants in American affluence and the degree to which the reasons for that have more to do with tradition and prejudice than any inherent failings of their own. The elevated expectations which television has

in part stimulated is one of the key elements in the social revolution which is going on around us.

(And I might add that here the communication quite clearly is two-way. As Ralph Abernathy and New Republic Columnish T.R.B. have both said, perhaps now that white America has had a chance to see how the confronted police officer sometimes behaves with some of us, we will exhibit a little more understanding about what the ghetto black feels and will be moved to demand a professionalization of police practice that will benefit all of society and remove a major irritant in the battle for racial equality.)

Now for a few moments let me talk about another category, drawing here on a paper by Harry Kalven, Jr., professor of law at the University of Chicago.[7] That category is concerned with the problem of privacy in the future. The possible *threats* to privacy come from three sources. They are changes in technology, in social institutions, and in our norms.

The problem regarding privacy in the future arises in the first place from the considerable improvements in the technology of eavesdropping. It is becoming increasingly possible to invade privacy without trespassing, using photographic, concealed microphone, closed circuit television, telephone taps, and mail surveillance devices. The situation which is already bad is likely to be far worse in the years ahead. Professor Kalven queries what could possibly be the greater evil growing out of this: having one's privacy intruded upon without being aware of it so that reliance on privacy is upset; knowing that there is no escape from surveillance; or finally, never being able to resolve the doubts about whether any given moment is private.

The power of the computer for record keeping and collating information about individuals represents another potential threat. Information initially collected for relatively innocuous purposes such as income tax, social security, and so on may, through cross referencing, easily be combined to produce a devastatingly detailed profile of each member of the society. The result? Everyone will live burdened by an unerasable record of his past and his limitations. As Kalven suggests, our passion for record keeping may cause society to lose its benign capacity to forget.

Other dimensions of the changes in our norms concerning the privacy of public figures can be seen in the ambivalence with which the public greeted the Kennedy-Manchester dispute, the protest of Mrs. Hemingway over A. E. Hochner's book on her husband, and the publication of the Bullitt-Freud manuscript on Woodrow Wilson.

[7] The analysis which follows, with a few amplifications here and there, is based on Professor Kalven's provocative chapter, "The Problems of Privacy in the Year 2000," Daedalus, Summer, 1967.

Still other norms might change. The technological eavesdropper, for example, may find his image improve since he may be seen as doing socially useful work. One should think too about the commercial invasions of privacy represented by such forms of public amusement as Candid Camera, or the Newlywed Game.

Two other threats to privacy may come, first, from our commitment to social science research which may call for methods of inquiry that infringe upon the privacy of the subjects of study and, second, from the problem of being constantly exposed to communications one does not wish to receive. This last is the threat that society may, from one quarter or another, largely become a captive audience.

True to our role as futurists, however, we should also direct our attention to possible counter measures which might lead to significantly different kinds of futures with respect to the problem of privacy. Professor Kalven suggests, for example, that public opinion could be made more sensitive to the values of privacy or that psychological and psychiatric studies might conceivably add something to our current knowledge about the importance of privacy to the mental health of the individual. It is possible that changes in our living habits could be developed to counteract some of our present patterns of behavior that seem to endanger privacy. Legal means to reduce invasions of privacy might be identified and secured. There is some question, for example, whether privacy can be made a *fundamental* norm in the solution of legal questions in contrast to the present situation where it remains a *residual* norm, which is to say, that things not for some other reason public are, by default, private. Finally, there is the interesting possibility that we might actually develop new institutions designed to insure some private moments in otherwise unprivate lives. The secular retreat is a possible line of direction, and Kalven, not altogether ironically, I think, suggests that it might very well be possible for someone by the year 2000 to make a fortune merely by providing on a monthly, weekly, daily, or even hourly basis, a room of one's own.

Let me touch on a fourth area, partly because it is very much before us this fall, partly because it may very well be *the* challenge facing us in the next thirty years. I refer to the problem of government in the future.

Much of our political and economic thought is based on 17th and 18th century thinking, particularly the purely rationalistic philosophy of utilitarianism. The model we still implicitly accept is that of a man who knows what his values are, who appraises the data in front of him, and who coolly and rationally chooses the correct—for him—course of action.

There are at least two flaws with this view that become increasingly apparent to us all as time goes by. The first is the adequacy of the

model in terms of what we know about man as an information processor and what we know about the availability of the relevant data to him at any given point in time.

We become increasingly aware that it is very difficult for men today tc ascertain what their values are, that the complexity of our society, technology, and organization is such that it becomes difficult to calculate the consequences of individual or collective acts, and third that we are very much the prisoners of the information nets of which we as individuals happen to be a part.

Secondly, as communications technology becomes more and more sophisticated and the opportunity for direct contact with large numbers of people continues to increase, the old model of the market mechanism and a smoothly functioning price system (which operates, of course, very much on the theory of individual decisions based on exclusively and highly rational grounds of the relation between individual choice and public welfare) no longer holds—if indeed it ever did. As Martin Shubik puts it, the old models of political and economic man will have to be rethought "to fit the pattern of the uncertain decision-maker acting under severely restricted conditions of information embedded within a communication system upon which he is becoming increasingly more dependent." [8]

Market mechanisms will not solve the problems of allocation in a complex society. Voting mechanisms may in some measure provide an alternative response, but then even more complicated issues arise relating to what is put to the vote and how often. The technology we have makes it conceivable that frequent referenda could be easily held on large numbers of issues. Will the technology bring about the reality? One has only to consider the spectacle of the American public voting on an anti-ballistic missile defense system or even a present day jury contemplating the complex details of a patent infringement case to bring to mind some of the serious problems which are involved here.

Our conception of man is not the only dimension to the problem of government in the future. Our present governmental and administrative structures grew out of a conception of the world which assumed the presence of balance, which assumed that over the long haul things would even themselves out. This world view produced our governmental form at the National level, and underlay the creation of a federal system for the nation as a whole.

However fruitful these ideas may have been in directing the past formation and growth of the United States, serious questions may be raised whether this essentially Newtonian conception of society as a superhuman organism kept in balance by superhuman forces is any

[8] Martin Shubik, "Information, Rationality, and Free Choice in a Future Democratic Society," Daedalus, Summer, 1967, p. 775.

longer adequate to the times. We no longer accept the notion that things will work themselves out; rather we have come much more to the view that the future is more a product of present decisions which we in fact are responsible for, than the continuing resolution of forces beyond human control.

We in the 20th century, need to look to new styles of creative thinking which are emerging about us just as, in a sense, the political theorists of the 18th century adopted Newtonian models of thought then coming into vogue. What is needed is the kind of thinking which can deal with open systems instead of closed systems, open systems characterized by unceasing functioning with ever-changing states and constant inputs and outputs.

Other possible styles of thinking which may contribute to a new political or governmental theory are cybernetics, the notion of self-organizing systems, and information theory.[9] Where the new political theory will come from is an open question, but that it must come in the decades immediately ahead of us is a precription I think it is fair to make if responsive, effective, and in some sense democratic institutions are to survive, albeit in new forms.

Finally, let me share an idea—a very large idea—that has just come my way. It is from one of the centers the Bureau of Research has recently established to conduct systematic thought and study on alternative futures for education.

In his beginning efforts to wrestle with the crucial educational issues of the decades to come—the time frame for the policy centers is 20 to 30 years ahead—Willis Harman, Director of the Educational Policy Research Center at Stanford Research Institute, has identified four basic assumption issues which are deeply involved in the crucial educational policy conflicts of the present and the near future. These, very briefly stated are:

1. The tension or polarity between the notion that individuals have essentially equal intellectual potentiality at conception and the view that individuals are significantly different in their intellectual potentialities at conception.

2. Man's aggressive instincts are instinctive-genetic in their origin vs. the view that they are essentially a product of environmental shaping.

3. Behavior is determined by heredity and environmental forces vs. the view that while behavior is influenced by those factors, it is also shaped by conscious reason, purpose, will, creativity, etc.

---

[9] See, for example, work such as Karl Deutsch, *The Nerves of Government*, The Free Press, New York, 1966.

4. The essentially individual self is an environmentally shaped ego vs. the view that the environmentally *influenced* ego, as experienced, is an aspect of a transcendental self.

Harman goes on to suggest that the scientific findings which relate to the solution of the above issues are suspect because the personal commitment of the investigators to one or another of the basic assumptions has influenced both the choice of research questions and the interpretation of the data. A key question for Harman, then becomes how scientific findings relate to the resolution of those issues. He points out that only a small fraction of research is aimed at establishing a preference between sets of basic assumptions; most investigations are framed within the context of a single set. Of particular importance is research (like the Michelson-Morley experiment) which, while framed within a belief system or paradigm, seems to raise questions as to the adequacy of that paradigm or system.

Harman's analysis then suggests that there are three "propositions" which accumulating evidence suggests may prove true to an extent far beyond what currently popular scientific assumptions can accommodate. These propositions have the most profound implications for educational policy and relate to the resolution of some of the issues identified a moment ago.

Those three propositions are:

1. Evidence is increasing that the potentialities of the individual human being are far greater in extent and diversity than we ordinarily imagine them to be or that our current models of man would lead us to think possible.

2. A far greater portion of significant human experience than we ordinarily feel or assume to be so is comprised of unconscious processes. These include not only the so-called "wisdom of the body" but intuition, creativity, and the like. In addition, we are beginning to learn how to gain access to these unconscious processes.

3. Of perhaps greatest significance in the realm of those unconscious processes are self-expectations, internalized expectations of others, images of the self and limitations of the self, and images of the future. All these play predominant roles in limiting or enhancing actualization of one's capacities. Whether one calls them, after Boulding, "organizing images," or self-fulfilling prophecies, or self-realizing images, the validity of such notions and their importance in our lives grows steadily in confirmation.

Harman then brings his argument around to its conclusion and his research paradigm to its beginning point. He notes that the most significant events in the history of Western thought in the last millenium have come when a group of questions which had previously been con-

sidered to be in the philosophical, metaphysical, or theological category, are shifted, by some vaguely defined consensual process, into the empirical category. The consequences of such a shift are manifold; research activities are started, education in that area becomes totally different, and warfare between belief systems is settled on a different basis.

The Copernican revolution is one example of such a revolution. Darwin symbolizes another such revolution. What Harman is beginning to believe is that the evidence suggests another such saltation is emerging today. The issues surrounding the human self, intellectual potential, aggression, and determinism vs. voluntarism, all now largely in the philosophical and metaphysical category, are moving slowly into the empirical category with all the attendent major reorientations in practice and belief one would expect from such a shift.

This is a huge idea. It may well turn out that the most important thing about it was to have conceived it in the first place so that it, too, becomes an "organizing principle" for us. If Harman is right we are in the midst of another of the real revolutions in Western thought with broad consequences for education and life as we know it.

I could go on. For each topical area we might identify or human condition that we might value or idea about the future we might propose, there are techniques available for responsible conjecture on where we may end up or where it is possible to get to from where we are. I have given here only a few examples; my intention was to be suggestive rather than exhaustive.

Suppose, then, that urban growth continues unabated, that population continues to expand and to increase in density, that the pace of technological growth continues to increase, that the knowledge explosion continues its chain reaction, and that the communication revolution makes its fruits, bitter tasting though some of them may be, available to every man. Suppose there are increased likelihoods of the danger of the invasion of privacy or the intrusion of man upon man, that the density of living induces changes in our social norms, that our society requires increasingly more highly educated citizens who are capable of frequent, and perhaps even radical, re-education, and that our governmental institutions require reconceptualization and, in turn, new styles of thinking to render those new forms fully operable. Suppose all of these things. What are the implications for educational goals and instructional objectives? What kinds of curricular objectives should we be establishing and what kinds of skills, competencies, and content acquisition should we demand our schools and universities develop as a minimum in the Nation's youth?

The *fact* of the knowledge explosion and the communications revolution is certainly one of the more provocative starting points for

thinking about educational objectives. And just as interesting, is the *character* of the knowledge explosion as it is increasingly manifesting itself. We can say with a great deal of certainty that anything a child or young person learns today will in 10 or 15 years be either invalid or occupying a rather different conceptual framework. Thus if it were ever true that the specific content a child learned in school would serve him as the timeless building blocks and tools to help him interpret his future world, it is certainly not true anymore. Whatever the content of his learning today, it is likely that it will have to be relearned once, twice, perhaps even three times again during the course of his life. The content of learning as such, therefore, is no longer assured.

Second, the fact that the advance of knowledge continues to increase at an expanding rate seems to place a premium on process goals rather than content goals. In a sense this was always true; now it is simply obvious to us. The most important thing to be learned is how to become a self-directed, self-motivating learner throughout the rest of one's life. The cliche is learning how to learn, but the most productive instructional orientation to the future appears to be serving that cliche as best we know how!

Third, the specific direction of much basic research raises other interesting points which bear rigorous speculation. For example, it appears that significantly increasing amounts of basic research are becoming interdisciplinary. Certainly, we should be able to find some implications in the fact that the *search* for knowledge is taking place within new structures, and while we seem to be busily *transmitting* it in terms of the *old*. The implications of the knowledge explosion associated with the validity of current content, the importance of process goals, and new styles of basic research all point to much more careful explication and justification of our current instructional objectives and the substantive or subject matter structures which express them.

A second major dimension of educational significance can be found in the increasing impact of technology on our lives. We need to develop and sustain much more sophisticated understandings in ourselves and our children of the powers and limits of technology. We have barely begun to do so. Think, for example of the significance of the computer in the lives of every one of us, but how many people know in some detail what it is, how it works, what it can do, and what it cannot do? Am I suggesting that everyone should take Computer 371b at sometime during his academic career? Some of you know I would intend nothing of the sort, but I certainly *would* maintain that as part of some or perhaps several lines of inquiry in which students at various times might be engaged, exploration of computers

and their capabilities should be an integral part. Those in the computer industry tell me that the last decade has seen a 1,000-fold increase in the power of the computer and that the next ten years will duplicate the performance of the last ten. Can there be any doubt of the importance then of this kind of understanding?

In using computers as a referent here, I have touched upon only *one* of many kinds of technological development which will require exploration. And the exploration must not be conducted mechanically. It must be done in terms of the richness of the human, social, and political context within which the technology operates and which is either the instrument of its control, or the passive and unknowing object of its subjugation. Lest "things be in the saddle and ride mankind," we must come to know and understand them and put them to *our* tasks.[10]

A third major dimension of educational impact, perhaps the most important in the long run if we are to win our race with catastrophe, is that much greater, more explicit, and more effective attention will need to be paid to education in all the domains other than cognitive which our educational patterns have tended to neglect. We need to understand motivation, teach to feeling, examine values, cultivate emotion, and help shape attitudes. We need to work directly on human creativity and the expansion of human potential. This is admittedly a more ticklish area of concern than is, say, cognitive development. Let me suggest some of the reasons why I believe it is so critically important for us to begin to deal with these areas now.

Increased population, the continuation of the urbanization process, the further development of communications technology, and the increased complexity of society will surely place tremendous pressures of new scope and dimension on psychological man. We can see them and feel them about and upon us now; we can guarantee only that the sources of such pressure will multiply. The improvements in transportation and communication, for example, virtually guarantee that our prejudices will be confronted, perhaps in harsh and brutal ways. The elimination of prejudice then becomes no longer a moral desideratum but a social necessity. If each man judges for himself and yet is inextricably bound up in the whole, than to the extent it is humanly and technically possible, society had best see that each individual's wisdom is as Solomon's.

Prejudice is but one example, and a negative one at that. Let me also illustrate the point I am making here in a positive way. I think it is

---

[10] Certainly under any discussion of the impact of technology on the present and the future should be the very careful, indeed, exhausting exploration of systems design and technological and social change. One of the best primers in this area is *The New Utopians* by Robert Boguslaw (Prentice-Hall, Inc., Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: 1965).

no accident that all over the country one finds new institutions springing up devoted to techniques of deepening and expanding the human capacity for close, meaningful, and warm interpersonal relationships, devoted to the greater release of human potential, and to the stimulation of creative impulses in man. The stresses of our post-modern existence on individual human beings in their social and interpersonal relationships demand the development of much finer senses of discrimination, perception, and understanding. Fortunately, the rewards derived from this enhanced capacity for interpersonal, competence, integrity, and appreciation become more satisfying as those capacities seem to become more necessary.

We are deeply concerned about the speed and pace of human life. We are disturbed by the degree to which we are forced into lives of "position occupancy" and "role fulfillment" rather than being allowed to express any existential or creative cravings we may have as human beings. Finally we are appalled by the tenor of impersonality, unresponsiveness, and apparent intractability of the complex social and technological whole. All these concerns appear to make a variety of techniques now receiving increasing notice not merely interesting but perhaps vital. Sensitivity training, T-groups, basic encounters, microlabs, facilitators, guided fantasy, and so on are some of the names of these techniques; Esalen, Kairos, Orizon, and Western Behavioral Sciences Institute are some of the places where it is being carried out. The adaptation of these techniques to schools and colleges, the responsible use of them, and their further development are high priority tasks which face us now and in the future.

Let me summarize what I have said tonight in the following way. The power of studying futures for education and, indeed, all other spheres, is the climate for decision thereby created in each of us. The future is invented by us, whether we will it or not. What it is to be and what we are to be in it is very much at the command of the choices we exercise, the data we collect and do not collect, and the decisions we make or do not make (and some of the most important decisions may very well be the ones we do not make). The study of futures becomes in many ways the most powerful of organizing principles. I may be permitted, therefore, a pointed paraphrase of Pogo to conclude my talk. "We have met the future, and he is us."

THE LIMITED RESPONSE OF GOVERNMENTAL INSTITUTIONS TO RAPID SOCIAL CHANGE—AND SOME ALTERNATIVES

EDWARD C. SYLVESTER, JR.

Assistant Secretary for Community and Field Services
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare

THE POOR and the black, most of whom are poor, have emerged only recently from what has been called "the invisible land" into the forefront of American attention. Their growing demand for full participation in our affluent democracy has exposed the failure of many American institutions which claim to serve their interests. Included among such institutions are Federal, State and local political entities, as well as the universities, churches, unions and similar groups.

So, the cry for change is hurled out by the poor, the black, the powerless and the unorganized. They want dignity and the ability to forge their own present and future, but this desire challenges long-established American institutons which do not yield easily to change. As Secretary Wilbur Cohen wrote in his July letter to employees of the Department:

> "People from all walks of life want a greater voice in solving their own problems and guiding their own destinies. Young people want to belong, to contribute, to have a hand in the decisionmaking process in their schools and jobs. Poor people want a greater role in the systems and institutions that govern their lives."

In the midst of the turmoil of the 18th century, the British statesman Edmund Burke said: "A state without the means of some change is without the means of its conservation." Burke was talking about the ability of the English government to recognize the right of the colonists in North America to self-government. He also said: "Deny them this participation of freedom, and you break that sole bond, which originally made, and must still preserve the unity of the Empire. . . . Magnanimity in politics is not seldom the truest of wisdom; and a great empire and little minds go ill together." We all know

Delivered December 4, 1968.

what happened as a result of the little English minds and the lack of magnanimity in refusing to allow the colonists to partake in decisions affecting them.

This country was born in the blood of displaced Englishmen and Europeans whom we call patriots, men who rebelled against an autocratic authority which refused to admit that the individual has a right to fix his own destiny. Is it not ludicrous that today, the same Nation, grown older, denies this right to large segments of its citizenry?

John Gardner told the Democratic Platform Committee this summer:

> "We're not only in trouble as a nation; we're in trouble as a species. Man is in trouble. And if you are not filled with foreboding, you don't understand your time. . . . The times cry out for swift and effective institutional change to avert disaster. But our institutions resist change with unholy stubbornness."

And Lisle Carter in his paper "Law and the Urban Crisis" said:

> "We cannot successfully confront solely the problems of the . . . individual poor person. We must deal also with the institutions and problems of the broader community that contains . . . that individual."

If we have learned one lesson from recent events, it is that the poor, the black, the Mexican-Americans, the students, feel alienated and disenfranchised with little control over the institutions or events which daily confront them. Specifically regarding the Negro, Roper Research Associates reported in September 1967 that 68 percent of Negroes were disturbed and angry about local government efforts to solve their problems. Roper reported that Negroes feel government action at every level is too slow. Similarly, the Kerner Commission reported that "ghetto residents increasingly believe they are excluded from the decision-making process which affects their lives and community. This feeling of exclusion, intensified by the bitter legacy of racial discrimination, has engendered deep-seated hostility toward the institutions of government."

While governmental institutions are failing to meet the needs of a certain segment of our population, they are indeed serving the overwhelming majority extraordinarily well. And the fact that this majority is better off than any comparable group has ever been is part of the problem. Institutions at all levels have been flexible and creative in adapting to our ever-increasing rate of productivity and the fabulous overall standard of living in the United States. Perhaps one reason for success is that this effort is clearly identifiable as in the national interest. But the segment that they are failing is more dependent on these institutions and paradoxically more intimidated by them. The middle

class citizen knows how to maneuver his way through the various bureaucracies that affect him. He knows how to influence the policy makers and where the pressure points of the bureaucracies are and how to utilize this knowledge.

Poor people, however, are largely devoid of the tools that the majority of Americans use regularly to gratify their wishes and sometimes their whims. Thus, the poor and the black man lacks the political, the social, and the legal wherewithal to have others defer to them and to demand equal results; they cannot deal effectively with the bureaucracies even though they control their daily lives to a greater extent than they affect the middle class. If the middle class citizen wants more heat, he knows how to get his landlord to deliver it fast. The middle class citizen is not dependent on welfare checks to get food for his children. If a merchant overcharges him, he complains and usually gets redress. This is not the same for the poor and the black. They simply lack the muscle and the "leverage."

Traditionally, the interests of those who have been left out of our great prosperity were thought to be represented by the service institutions themselves, as well as by para-governmental interests that function essentially as part of the decision and policy making apparatus at all levels of government. Churches, welfare workers associations, parent-teachers organizations, labor unions, and all sorts of special groups operate hand in glove with governmental agencies. And this is as it should be. However, these para-governmental forces, which seem to be logical exponents of the poor, the black and the powerless, and often are, find frequently that their immediate interests are inimical to the overall interests of their unorganized brothers. For example, the rising tide for neighborhood control of primary and elementary schools runs smack into the growing unionization of school teachers and their job security. Family planning, clearly and desperately needed by the poor, is opposed by certain elements of the church, many of whose members work throughout agencies and institutions which should push family planning. In the struggle for equal employment opportunity, black workers, Mexican-American and Puerto Rican workers often find the labor union's cherished and hard won seniority system a major block to upward and lateral mobility to better jobs. Seniority, itself, is not bad but it can function to the disadvantage of workers whose placement was discriminatory in the first instance.

So, while it is claimed that many of these groups represent the poor and the minorities, it is apparent that often they do not. Nothing else, however, has been developed on behalf of the poor with the same expertise and resources. Thus, the bureaucracies continue to serve the majority of Americans very successfully but certain pockets are not yet served and this is a national tragedy.

Another example of this is the failure of President Johnson's proposal to establish a new department of economic development, which was to include at least some of the activities of the Labor Department, the Commerce Department, and others. This new department was to coordinate, among other things, the disparate Federal economic anti-poverty efforts. Obviously, business and labor interests were not supportive of this idea. But who spoke directly for the more than 25 million poor Americans who had most to gain? Nobody.

A great opportunity for significant institutional change succumbed to the status quo.

It should be made clear that none of the above suggests deliberate anti-black or anti-poor activity. The point is that the immediate concerns of these interests are not always consistent with the overall legitimate goals of the poor and the black.

Involving minority groups in the formulation and implementation of efforts to improve their lives is a relatively new idea. It began in the late 1950's with the Ford Foundation's so-called "Gray Areas Program." Under this program, the Foundation helped sponsor community projects initiated and implemented by local organizations. According to Paul Ylvisaker, who was head of the Gray Areas Program, "It is not dependency we want to encourage, but independence and choice."

When in 1961 the President's Committee on Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Crime was established, the Federal Government adopted the Ford Foundation's concept of community involvement. The Committee, among other steps, urged that an attempt be made to help reduce juvenile delinquency by organizing communities to improve themselves.

The most significant beginning of change in this area of community involvement and citizen participation came in August, 1964, with the passage of the Economic Opportunity Act. Recalling the emphasis of the Ford Foundation and the President's Committee, the authors of Title II of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 specified that community action programs should be "developed, conducted and administered with the maximum feasible participation of the areas and the members of the groups served." Thus, citizen participation became a national policy. Under the 1967 Green amendment to the Economic Opportunity Act, community action agencies were modified to give control to local political institutions. But the general principle of community development continues to guide the Office of Economic Opportunity and is fundamental to the Model Cities Program.

In the four years since the beginning of the "War Against Poverty," there has been much criticism of the Office of Economic Opportunity.

Dr. Kenneth Clark, in testimony before the Senate Subcommittee on Executive Reorganization, said that he thought that "the emphasis on community action as the core for effective solution of slum problems seems to be more verbal than actual"; he sees it as no more effective than the old social service approach. Despite criticisms, however, some significant contributions must be credited to OEO:

1. The first, of course, is the formulation of national policy that the poor should have a voice in decisions affecting their lives;

2. The second is the undeniable fact that OEO efforts have stimulated change in Federal, State and local institutions;

3. Third, OEO had the courage to fund innovative and politically risky programs in the search for ways to end the cycle of poverty;

4. Fourth, OEO provided additional Federal funds to traditional agencies for socio-economic purposes, which these agencies most likely would not have received;

5. OEO's legal services program, provided the poor with professionally qualified advocates. Perhaps this will be the most lasting memorial to the OEO, for it was this legal services program which began to attack the bureaucracies on behalf of the poor and which gave impetus to one of today's most important movements—the welfare rights organizations.

The welfare rights movement is quite properly focusing its attention at the Federal as well as local levels. But the role of advocacy groups at the State and local levels should not be overlooked. Take, for example, the program recently announced by Secretary Cohen, whereby Federal matching funds will be available to States to establish legal services programs for public welfare clients. It can be expected that many States will be unwilling to expend funds for this program unless they are pressed; it is up to organized advocate groups of the poor, such as the National Welfare Rights Organization, to apply the pressure. Thus, the welfare rights organization may well be the first such movement to act as an advocate of the poor, balancing, at least in part, the influence exerted by other interest groups which function effectively within the various bureaucracies but which do not represent the interests of the ultimate consumer.

The demands upon the bureaucracies are constant, varied and competing. All too often that pressure group which is most vocal or best organized sees its demands gratified, despite contrary national priorities. Therefore, the poor must press their interests constantly, not just at the top of the bureaucracies, but up and down the line at every level of decision. Almost every interest in this country has, within the Federal establishment and most State and local governments, people who in addition to their regular duties, understand and repre-

sent its specific point of view. In the Labor Department many officials are from the unions and the labor movement. Similarly, the Office of Education is inhabited by educators from the establishment. They are present in the daily dialogue that takes place while policies are developed, decisions are made and procedures promulgated. But there are no poor anywhere and very few blacks where it really counts.

Now, partially as a result of OEO and the Poor People's Campaign, some correction is taking place. Commitments to include representatives of the poor on a wide range of Governmental advisory committees are being implemented. This is no easy task, considering the fact that HEW alone has nearly 500 of them.

Representation of the poor on committees is not the answer in itself. I should like to propose at least three other devices. These proposals are based on the notions that our institutions, in their present form, have some, but not all, of the needed ability to service the poor; that these institutions are not going to adjust rapidly to the current need; and that it is more feasible to supplement their current capability than to try major overhauls and restructuring. I believe that all the foregoing supports these premises.

First, cohesive constituencies, capable of bringing about change within the framework of the service institutions themselves must be created. These constituencies would serve to balance off the well-entrenched interests which do not represent the ultimate client population. Such creation will be slow—perhaps almost evolutionary.

The civil rights movement has been shifting from an emphasis on legislative and legal remedies to the economic issues—jobs, training, entrepreneurship—as well as the building of political power through voter registration drives. But its limited knowledge of how our institutions function has kept it from seeing the importance of day-to-day contact with bureaucracies at all levels. The efforts of the civil rights groups to deal with bureaucracies so far have been minimal. I see little indication that the movement is likely to fill this very important gap in the near future.

Secondly, these same constituencies must operate to bring about changes in the constraints and parameters within which the institutions function. This too will be slow developing. The real rules of institutional practices are highly sophisticated, more often than not hidden, and almost always quite different from those on the books. An excellent example, at least at the national level, concerns the relation between the Executive Branch and the Legislative Branch, the latter being a particularly complex and almost unfathomable bureaucracy. It is, however, very effective in its own way. This relationship is carried on in such a way as to make it almost impossible for the citizens of

this country, rich or poor, to determine with any certainty exactly where the root of a problem lies. And yet this knowledge is absolutely essential if the democratic process is to have real meaning. The poor and black, of course, are doubly handicapped. The shell game of who did what to whom and when and why leaves the unsophisticated little idea of where the pressure points are and no idea of when to apply the pressure.

Adding to this dilemma is the frequent practice, often due to political expediency or necessity, of discussing domestic programs in terms of progress and gains, and not in terms of unmet needs, even when those are agreed upon. This confuses many Americans, especially those of the middle class, who cannot understand why the poor and the black are rebelling in the face of alleged progress and accomplishment. The poor and the black on the other hand hear the rhetoric and, knowing that their situation has changed very little, grow more hostile toward the total society.

All of this compounds the difficulty for any concerned constituency which attempts to change the external framework and to gain helpful allies in the effort.

The Poor People's Campaign in Washington this Spring did prove, however, that the poor, speaking for themselves, can indeed have an impact on the Federal bureaucracies. From my own experiences first in the Labor Department and now at HEW, I can testify to the extent of this impact. There have been periodic reviews of what was promised and what has been done regarding the promises. And there has been continuing contact with representatives of the Poor People's Campaign.

But the Campaign, unfortunately, did not develop an adequate strategy to make an impact on the Congress. Nor were those grievances which could be redressed only by the Congress successfully presented. And, I believe that whatever gains were made, insofar as the Federal institutions are concerned, will soon ebb away unless there is massive follow-up by the poor.

Third is the need to develop a series of new public and private institutions to span the gap between the poor and the black and the large existing institutions. These new institutions should operate at the local level and should serve to shortstop and resolve many problems at that level. They should serve as conveyances into the existing institutions and they should train their clients in how to operate successfully with the existing institutions. This is not proposing anything really new—insofar as the total institution scene is concerned. What is suggested in large part is an adaptation of techniques tried in other areas, to the problems of the poor and the black. Nor is any great increase

in bureaucracy meant. These new institutions ought to be accommodated out of the continuing expansion of existing institutions—particularly State and local governments.

For example, the principles of conciliation, mediation and arbitration have served labor and management efficiently and well—avoiding lengthy shutdowns, legal proceedings and the like. The Center for Disputes Settlement, a new arm of the American Arbitration Association, is attempting to extend these principles into the area of ghetto problems, and—if it can establish the necessary credibility—will make a sound contribution to a new way of doing things for its clients.

Another example would be the creation of independent research and informational institutes at the local and national levels. These institutes would provide analysis of legislation, programs, and the bureaucratic process for organizations such as civil rights groups and the welfare rights movement. Provided with the expertise necessary to act on their own behalf, they, in turn, would make their own representations to the pertinent institutions. Such institutes would serve in a capacity similar to the hundreds of trade associations familiar to almost any businessman, except that they would not be a lobby—their clients would do their own lobbying.

There are undoubtedly many similar techniques, routinely used in other endeavors, that could well be applied to meet the special problems of those left out of our society—should sufficient analysis and study be put to the task. To date, mechanisms have been developed for others to gain access to the nation's resources; Why shouldn't it be the same for the poor and the black?

The Kerner Commission talked of two Americas and the growing polarization between black and white. I believe this. And I do not doubt that this will accelerate if we do not begin to bring those now left out of American society into full participation in it. Our institutions must bend; they must allow those who are affected by bureaucratic decisions to partake in making them. At the same time, the poor and the black must gain the wherewithal to demand and get equal results at all levels of the relevant institutions.

> Senator Edward M. Kennedy said about a year ago: "Much of the disorder and disaffection in our nation can be traced to the feeling that our institutions have grown so large and so remote that they no longer react to the changing needs of our people . . . In a society increasingly preoccupied with protest and repression of protest, our domestic tranquillity and ultimately the future of our free system may depend upon whether we can make our institutions responsive to the pressures for peaceful change."

LEADER: A PERSON THAT LEADS

JAMES H. MCCROCKLIN
Under Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare

I AM not here to give you a factual, statistic-ridden report, I have come to talk about the sometimes ephemeral, oftentimes elusive, but always real phenomenon of leadership.

When I was asked to deliver this address I was inclined to style my talk as "A Compendium of Truth: or the Way It Is." However further thought convinced me to lower the banner but not my sights. Thus the title, "Leader: A Person That Leads." The issues are not unique to any level of government or business, but every level from the lowest position to the Presidency is covered. President Harry Truman was famous for two statements in this regard. On his desk he had the quote "The Buck Stops Here" and in his fine Missouri style he made the often quoted statement, "If you can't stand the heat keep out of the kitchen." Therefore we are here to look at the temperature and whose holding the "buck."

Recently I read a short article that quoted an interview with a new corporate executive.

> He was asked, "What do you think of your new responsibility and honor?" His reply was classic: "The first 22 minutes were great." [1]
>
> The article continued: "The first 22 minutes were great . . . the press clippings, congratulations of friends, and the inner warmth of achievements after dedicated energies and years. He enjoyed about 22 minutes of such applause, and then faced, as all top executives must, giant-sized question marks in decision-making and a strange sense of increased isolation in an even larger world of influence." [2]

[1] "The First 22 Minutes Were Great" by Dr. Reuben Gornitzka, President, Direction, Inc., TWA Magazine, October 1968, p. 22.
[2] *Ibid.*

Delivered December 18, 1968.

After a short 22 minutes he had found the "heat." He had reached the apex of his corporate structure and the altar of management. He was prepared to take his job for better or for worse. His firm had asked him the most logical question, "Are you prepared to exert leadership?" His answer was a firm "I am."

What are the elements that allowed the instant reply of "I am" and how are these accomplished?

A successful and progressive activity has a leader at its head. The role of leadership in government or business affairs is that of organizing the resources of the unit in order to carry out, efficiently and effectively, the program. Leadership is the backbone of management and is the basis of action. The hallmark of leadership is the ability of getting people to work together when they are under no obligation to do so. The need for leadership is more apparent today than ever before and, given the complexities of modern society, the lack of leadership can become more expensive than ever before.

All administrative heads are different personalities and come from various fields, but they all share one common problem—they must, if they are to succeed, develop some sort of leadership ability. As leaders, they, more than anyone else, are expected to see that policy is made and that those involved are kept informed. "A strong leader knows that if he develops his associates he will be even stronger." If the leaders refuse to fill the leadership potential, the community, a corporation, at its best will operate with a caretaker arrangement which will do little more than keeping the doors of the establishment open.

Leadership has been defined as "a process of mutual stimulation which by the successful interplay of relevant individual differences controls human energy in the pursuit of a common cause." However, one must distinguish leadership from domination where a superior assumes a position of command and demands obedience from those below him in the command structure. There are many dominators in government and business, but a shortage of real leaders.

Leadership has been defined as: "The art of getting someone else to do something that you want done because he wants to do it." In simple words the leader must influence his followers by his own examples, his human relations, his personal persuasion, and other elements that are all based on the element of free choice. He cannot and must not turn to the irrational, emotional, or petty approach that is found in the agitator or political demagogue. He must realize that he is a leader and a follower. A person may look one way to lead and in turn must face the other way and follow. He must help create public opinion and must also realize that he is the creature of public opinion. In the absence of active leadership a policy vacuum will exist. I recall

one statement on leaders that said: "There are two kinds of leaders—those interested in the flock and those interested in the fleece." Those we are interested in should be interested in the flock.

No matter how fine the position of leadership is, it is never complete. No matter how well you may lead the majority there is always the minority who must have their dissent heard and dealt with. You cannot lead all people through the same door at the same time. An organization or a government unit should never be built merely to follow a leader, but the factors of leadership must be built into the entire unit. This must be done so that leadership appears at every level of the unit, in every department, in every committee, on every work team. This is not to underestimate the importance of the top administrator. Indeed, he or they are the nerve center of any unit and the structure of organization must take this into account, but one must realize that leadership goes throughout an organization and does not cease at the top. A real leader is effective because he is assisted by men and women possessing the qualities of a leader at every level. "A good leader inspires other men with confidence in him; a great leader inspires them with confidence in themselves."

It goes without saying that the personality of the individual determines his approach to leadership. However, from the approach the man leaves personality and must produce on his own. He must work to strengthen his organization and staff. An administrator is known by the staff he puts together and how this group produces. His staff is in effect, his own reputation. He cannot pass this responsibility on to others. If he tries to be a "jack-of-all-trades" he will most logically become a "master of none." He leads by putting together a capable and sincere staff and must win the respect and confidence of these employees. The word should be underlined because he must *earn* this respect. No administrator has ever been successful by *demanding* respect and confidence. The leader is involved in a process of integration for he seeks to gather together the interests and desires of his staff and public into a goal that is socially attainable. When the goal is attained, he should be quick to pass the glory on to others. No leader is better than the people he leads. Therefore, the real leader passes the praise on to his team. One must realize that there is usually enough praise for all, and often the more you pass on the more that eventually comes back to you. *No leader is any better than the people under him think he is.* From my military days I remember a quote on this subject—"Any commander who fails to obtain his objective, and who is not dead or severely wounded, has not done his full duty." Remember that in government and business the wounds are there, only the weapons have changed.

Think of the amount of money that is spent daily by government and business in the United States. Think of this cost in light of the image of leadership you are trying to develop. Are you producing a well led unit and giving the citizen stockholder his dollars worth or are you an eager compromiser? A leader can afford to compromise policy, but never principle. The leader works to improve, and although he may never reach perfection, he never loses sight of it. He may often be measured by his willingness to say "No." It is easier to take the line of least resistance and say "Yes." But the leader must place public interest above personal gain and the pressures of petty groups or politics.

If successful, the dedicated leader has a real sense of accomplishment. The work will take extra hours and the pitfalls may be rough, but when the job is done he will feel that the burden of the responsibilities is worth the effort. A real leader without the pressures of leadership would be like a fish out of water. The larger the group he leads, the more alone he will find himself.

> "In an NBC–TV network show dealing with work on the level of executive responsibility, a large and poignant picture of the late President Kennedy was shown. He stood alone in his White House office, his back to the camera, hands in pockets, and looking out the window. The advisors had advised. The reports lay consumed on the desk. Now, came the lonely decision. The 'yes' or 'no.' Then live with that decision, defend it; hope and pray the decision is right, and like a ball player's hit (single, double or home run), add to one's executive 'batting average,' to one's executive usefulness and worth—or strike out with an opposite effect." [3]

When a leader arrives at this lonesome spot he might look back and see the elements he has used in his successful rise to leadership. The list would include all or most of the following:

1. COURAGE

Courage is, in my opinion, associated with ambition. The courage to risk one's reputation in order to carry out what you believe is right. The courage to sacrifice what you have in order to accomplish more for the benefit of the total program.

2. HEALTH AND STRENGTH

The long hours and great stresses demand good health and physical strength. True, a number of men have risen to great positions without these but these men were the exceptions rather than the rule.

3. EMOTIONAL STABILITY

Leadership demands emotional stability. It is no place for the emotionally immature.

[3] *Ibid.*

4. INTELLIGENCE AND EDUCATION

Note the inclusion of intelligence and education. The leader must have basic intelligence as well as some education for the immediate task at hand. The education can be formal or informal.

5. CONFIDENCE AND AMBITION

He must act with confidence and instill his fellow workers with a desire to follow him. He needs ambition because without it a leader would stagnate and decay.

6. CAPACITY TO MAKE DECISIONS PROMPTLY USING SOUND JUDGMENT

The ability to make decisions promptly based on sound facts and judgments is a major key to the larger door of leadership, decisions postponed become more difficult for all, if not impossible to make.

7. SENSITIVITY TO THE GROUP LED AND HUMANENESS

One must understand the group he leads and have a humaneness about this group. It is difficult for a non-teacher to lead a teachers group, a non-black to lead a black people's program, or a non-Indian to lead a tribe or council. You must understand the group and have an identity with them to be the most effective leader.

8. ABILITY, IMAGINATION, AND INVENTIVENESS

These three items are self-explanatory but to go a step farther and to put them in perspective, I sometimes think that the Poor People's Campaign was in many ways an indictment of the lack of these in our bureaucratic system.

9. CONSISTENCY WITH SOUND PLANNING

All programs demand sound planning and without consistency added to this facet the overall program will suffer.

10. SUPER SALESMANSHIP WITH A SENSE OF HUMOR

Humor can often bring eager relief when all problems seem insurmountable. It must be remembered when one loses his temper he normally loses his ability to think clearly.

11. GAMBLER'S ATTITUDE AND THE ABILITY TO REMAIN FREE OF ENMITY

Never hold a grudge. Wipe the slate clean each day and cultivate a spirit of greatness.

12. A DASH OF LUCK AND CIRCUMSTANCES

Sometimes even with all the points going in your direction luck and circumstances play a key role, but remember you need the other abilities to capitalize on the new task when fate unexpectedly turns your way.

Not all these points are needed but the more possessed by a person the easier leadership comes. Leadership must create and nurture the proper ferment for change not merely implement ongoing programs.

Leadership is a privilege. If a man possesses the required attributes, it is his obligation to lead and he should advance as far as his capacity of leadership will take him. He should let leadership spread horizontally and not vertically or selfishly toward himself. Dr. Gornitzka, head of Direction, Inc., reports asking a group of busy executives the following question: "How do you make it, an impossibly demanding position, home and family responsibilities, community demands and involvement, and likely as well national or even international obligations. And with just 24 hours to your day?"

One reply quoted stated, "Work at it, believe in it, pray at it and if the best I have isn't good enough, the company will have to get another president. I'll still make a living, still hold my head up, believe in myself and be me. I don't have to be president." He continued: "The day I was able to say that, I relaxed enough to do the best all-around job I've ever done."

He had found that the temperature although hot was not intolerable.

Leadership can only be achieved by the individual and one should not be critical of another leader for being better than yourself—remember, it is not his fault. The leader's efforts must be deliberate and persistent, and if they are, he too, may approach the altar and give a firm, "I am."

PROGRESS, PROBLEMS AND CHALLENGES IN HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

WILBUR J. COHEN
Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare

AS I approach the completion of 34 years of public service, I would like to share with you some of my thoughts and reflections on the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, its mission, its great achievements and the challenges that it will face in the years ahead.

In five days, on Monday, January 20, the Nation will inaugurate a new President. Within a short time a new Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare will be sworn into office. A new decade of history will begin. There will be a new opportunity to look at national problems with a fresh perspective, sift ideas and set higher national goals.

I have no fears that the Department's responsibilities will diminish in the years ahead. I have every reason to believe that the Department will continue to strive for a life of meaning and dignity and fulfillment for every individual.

There may be some shifts in the Department's growth and priorities, some changes in organization but there will continue to be a big job ahead for everyone in HEW. I am confident that the Department's programs reflect the deepest values of the American people, and that the people want them to continue to grow. The rapid growth of HEW programs over the past eight years are the direct result of those desires.

Since 1960, the Department's budget has tripled, making the budget of this Department the largest of all the domestic cabinet departments. The number of programs administered by the Department has more than doubled. Some 250 programs now range over the entire life-cycle of the individual.

Delivered January 15, 1969.

The surge of activity which has characterized the Department has seen the outgrowth of 138 new laws enacted since 1960. This legislation initiated the most comprehensive assault on social problems in this Nation's history. Some of these laws—Medicare, Elementary and Secondary Education, Health Manpower, the Community Mental Health Act—represent the fruition of many years of debate and controversy.

The legislative accomplishments of the past eight years provided the tools that helped us make very real progress in terms of peoples' lives:

—The number of people living in poverty declined 45 percent in the last eight years—from 40 million in 1960 to an estimated 22 million people.

—The average social security benefit has been increased 71 percent in 8 years.

—The infant mortality rate has declined 15 percent.

—Nearly 20 million elderly people now have health insurance through Medicare.

—The number of people in State mental hospitals has declined from 536,000 in 1960 to 426,000 in 1967—a 21 percent decline.

—Nine million children are benefitting from special programs in poverty areas under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

—Over 1½ million college students are receiving Federal financial help for their education, compared to a little over 100,000 in 1960.

The progress made in recent years has been unprecedented but the national effort has just begun. There remain serious and difficult human problems that demand continued attention. We cannot be content as long as any American lacks access to the best health care obtainable, full educational opportunity and the economic opportunity to enjoy the full benefits of a prosperous America. Today, too many Americans do not have these opportunities.

The basic problem we face in improving health, education and welfare in the United States is the great variation among States in financing and providing these services. The per capita income of the highest State (Connecticut) is more than double that of the lowest State (Mississippi). There are three times as many physicians per 100,000 population in New York as there are in Mississippi. New York's average per pupil school expenditure is over 2½ times as high as Mississippi's. The average monthly child welfare payment per recipient is over seven times as high in New York as in Mississippi.

We must find ways to prevent these vast disparities. In a Nation as mobile as ours, a child in Mississippi needs just as good an education

as the one in New York. Yet Mississippi does not have the economic resources to provide that kind of education. I believe we are going to have to provide more Federal assistance to equalize the opportunities of people for health, education and welfare regardless of where they live. The Federal government is going to have to pay for a larger share of these costs.

These inequalities are at the heart of many of the challenges we face in each of these areas. Let me begin with the health challenges.

Recent health legislation such as Medicare, Medicaid and a number of other laws, have established high quality health care as a basic right for all citizens, not a privilege reserved for the affluent. However this right has not been realized for many Americans. Too many barriers still stand in the way. Health manpower shortages, rising health costs, inadequate and fragmented services, inefficiencies of operations prevent people from the health care they need. We must find ways to break down these barriers.

In the education field, we face challenges at every level from preschool to adult learning. How to assure every child a high quality education and as much education as he is capable of and desires, are problems that continue to perplex us. We know that some students start from behind in the national achievement tests and fall further behind as they progress through school. But we are not quite sure yet how to close the achievement gap and provide high quality learning experiences for all children.

At the level of higher education, enrollments are increasing rapidly. Yet many capable students are denied a higher education because of lack of adequate finances. How to provide facilities and resources to meet expanding enrollments, without sacrificing quality, and how to assure every student the opportunity to an education are demanding challenges in the face of rising costs.

One of the greatest challenges we face is the elimination of poverty. In 1967, there was an estimated 25.9 million people living in poverty. Almost 30 percent lived in households headed by aged or disabled persons. Another 32 percent—about 8.2 million poor persons—lived in households where the heads held full-time, year around jobs. An estimated 18.4 million poor persons in 1967 lived in households that were headed by nondisabled persons under 65 years of age. Forty-five percent of these people were in households headed by a person who worked the full year, 35 percent in households headed by a part year worker, and 20 percent in households where the head did not work at all in 1967.

Work experience was directly related to the sex of the head of the household. Male headed households accounted for over 80 percent of

the persons in households headed by full-year workers. Female headed households, on the other hand, accounted for over 80 percent of the persons in households where the head did not work at all.

Whereas poverty among the aged and the disabled could be practically eliminated by substantial improvements in the social security program, the elimination of poverty among the nondisabled under age 65 group will require a number of approaches, including education, training, family planning and improved public assistance programs.

The present welfare systems must be drastically overhauled. Drastic changes must be made in the scope of coverage, the adequacy of payments, and in the way payments are administered. A first step in this direction would be to substitute the present hodge-podge system with a Federally financed system of income payments for the aged, for the blind, disabled, and dependent children. Eligibility, the amount of payments, financing and appeals would be determined on a national basis.

Such a system would overcome many of the problems of inequity, State variations, and fiscal inadequacy which have plagued the States and the present welfare system for more than 30 years.

I am convinced that with continued economic growth, intelligent fiscal and monetary policies and improved social, education and health programs poverty can be eliminated. If the Nation has the will, it has the resources to abolish want and destitution.

In a Nation where the gross national product is growing at an annual average rate of $50 billion, its citizens can and must set high goals, for a Nation's greatness is measured not so much by the wealth it accumulates as by how it uses that wealth for the happiness and well-being of its people.

Our Nation, a unique experiment in democracy, was founded on the belief in freedom and opportunity. As we approach the 200th Anniversary of the Declaration of Independence it is appropriate that we rededicate ourselves to these goals. Let us set forth some principles and programs to help us attain goals which will assure freedom and opportunity for all citizens by 1976:

—Let us pledge ourselves to a Bill of Rights for the aged which will assure an adequate social security program, decent housing and adequate community services.

—Let us adopt a program to abolish poverty—a program which would include jobs, education and training, health services and consumer protection.

—Let us assure every child the basic right to be born well and wanted; the right to health care through childhood and the right to education at all levels.

—And let us adopt a platform to give every consumer an even break.

I believe that if the Nation commits itself to these principles and adopts programs to implement them that by the 200th Anniversary of this Nation, within the next seven years, we can:

—Raise median annual family income from the present $8,000 to $12,500.

—Continue to expand medical research and rapidly disseminate the results to prevent and cure diseases and disabilities.

—Increase life expectancy by another two years.

—Cut infant mortality in half.

—Give every 3-to-5-year-old child the opportunity to go to nursery school or kindergarten.

—Eliminate illiteracy.

—Increase the number of persons 25 years or older in the population who graduated from college from 10 percent to 15 percent.

—Nearly triple the number of handicapped persons rehabilitated annually.

—Increase public and private expenditures for health, education, and welfare as a percent of GNP from the present 19.8 percent to 25 percent.

The realization of the goals will depend primarily on the Nation's commitment to them. This will be the test of the Nation's greatness in the years to come.

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE: 1968